



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors

Gloria Molina
Yvonne Burke
Zev Yaroslavsky
Don Knabe
Michael D. Antonovich, Mayor

2006

PUBLIC MEMBERS

First District

George J. Gliaudys, Esq.
Jane Preece, Esq.

Second District

Paula G. Leftwich
John O. Murrell

Third District

Lucy T. Eisenberg, Esq., Chair
Janice Kamenir-Reznik, Esq.

Fourth District

Jean F. Cohen
Maria C. Tortorelli, Esq.

Fifth District

Reginald Brass
Susan Speir, Vice Chair

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

Chief Information Office

Jon W. Fullinwider

Department of

Children and Family Services
Dr. David Sanders

Department of

Public Social Services
Bryce Yokomizo

Child Support Services

Department
Philip Browning

Los Angeles Superior Court

David Jetton

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

California Department of

Child Support Services
Mary Lawrence

Franchise Tax Board

Debbie Strong

CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES MARCH 23, 2006

Present

2nd District, John Murrell
4th District, Jean Cohen
5th District, Reginald Brass
5th District, Susan Speir

Chief Information Office,
Jim Hall
Child Support Services,
Steven Golightly
Children and Family Services,
Sue Harper
Public Social Services,
Rosie Ruiz

Guests

Lori Cruz	CSSD
Wayne D. Doss	CSSD
Gail Juiliano	CHIEF, QAPI
Julie Paik	CSSD

Staff

Jim Corbett	Board of Supervisors
Gabe Alexander	Board of Supervisors
Tim McTighe	Board of Supervisors
Austin Patteson	Board of Supervisors

Absent

1st District, George J. Gliaudys, Jr., Esq.
1st District, Jane Preece, Esq.
2nd District, Paula Leftwich
3rd District, Lucy T. Eisenberg, Esq.
3rd District, Janice Kamenir-Reznik, Esq.
4th District, Maria Tortorelli

CA Department of Child Support
Services, Mary Lawrence
Franchise Tax Board,
Debbie Strong
Superior Court,
David Jetton

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Speir called the meeting to order as a Committee of the Whole at 9:39 a.m. in the Dan River Room of the Child Support Services Department in Commerce.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT — To include: State Budget, County Budget, Allocation Committee

Chief Deputy Director Steven Golightly reported that:

- State and County budget requests from CSSD have been submitted for the upcoming fiscal year, and await revision by the Governor in May. At the Federal level, a loss of \$90 million in aid to State and county child support programs will occur in 2007 due to changes in incentive programs, unless successful legal challenges are raised in Washington.
- The Allocation Committee meets March 28th in Sacramento and discussions regarding re-allocation of funds among the 58 counties will continue, as well as discussions regarding possible future increases in funding from the State.
- CSSD has been granted a one month extension and will not go “live” with the State Disbursement Unit until May 1st. 275,000 letters have been sent to recipients informing them of changes that will affect the manner in which checks are received, the appearance of checks, and that there may be some delays in receiving checks.
- CSSD has received a grant of \$145,000 from the County's Quality and Productivity Commission which will be combined with federal funds for a total of about \$400,000. The two year grant will focus on securing private health insurance coverage both for children on public assistance and other children without health coverage.
- Dan Lewis, Chief Legal Counsel for CSSD, met this week with Lori Cruz and others regarding legal operations in the County. Mary Lawrence is the new Regional Administrator of DCSS.
- FTB recently visited the CSSD Call Center, and is using it as a model for implementation of the State-wide child support automated system. FTB was particularly complimentary of the management of the call center.
- Security measures have been taken to prevent a repeat of the recent incident at DPSS where confidential materials were taken and then provided to the media.

DCSS REPORT — To include update on health insurance issues

Mary Lawrence had no report at this time. Ms. Speir reported on her attempt to test a State-given phone number for eligible CPs to use when insurance companies refuse to issue cards. The operator could only offer to take an oral report that might result in further action. The use of this number is now being reconsidered.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS PERFORMANCE MEASURES

No comments were made.

REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF CENTRALIZED INTAKE/BENCHMARKS **— GAIL JUILIANO**

Ms. Juiliano reported that:

- The intake process has undergone recent reform by creating a Central Intake Division. This division now performs only a “case create” function because reapplications are now diverted. Early this year, Campaign 4 was begun to review the Case-Create Process. The purpose is to evaluate the successes and possible improvements to the system, and optimize compliance with federal regulations.

Mr. Wayne Doss then presented a detailed “case create process map”:

- Various complex processes are involved. The Campaign focuses on efforts to analyze the efficiency of each step in the process for both welfare and non-welfare cases.
- Measurements of the time used in each step of the process will be used to implement improvements in speed without reducing quality and accuracy.
- Many cases are opened in order to meet the stricter federal time regulations but are ultimately denied.

It was agreed that an updated report would be presented to the Board in June.

REPORT ON PREPARATIONS FOR SDU TRANSITION

Ms. Julie Paik reported that:

- California is one of only two states not in compliance with federal law requiring one automated state-wide system and pays severe penalties as a result.
- California is implementing this state-wide system in two phases. The first phase implements the State Disbursement Unit, which will handle

processing of payments. The fifth and final wave of this phase is scheduled to begin April 1st, but Los Angeles County will not begin its participation until May 5th.

- County workers are being trained to work with the new State-wide Services System (SWS), which workers will use with ARS.
- As a result of this transition, numerous issues have surfaced. Significant amounts of money were kept on hold during Wave 1, and Orange County experienced delays in check processing during Wave 2.
- When Los Angeles County implements the system, all checks will be re-routed to the State for processing. The State also will keep its own audit trail. As a result, it is estimated that 4% to 10% of NCP payments will be delayed in the first month as this trail is established. This amount should be reduced to 1% in the second month, but this is still a significant amount which will impact Los Angeles County.
- Changes in posting dates for NCP payments by the State will also result in delays. This will affect receipt of checks by CPs, and NCPs may be found delinquent. The State hopes this will be a temporary problem and that NCPs will pre-pay in the future.
- The State has entered into an exclusive contract with VISA to enable NCPs to make credit card payments, but each payment is charged with a \$7.50 service fee and is limited to \$2000. This results in some NCPs having to pay numerous fees. The overall impact of the service fees is significant and may discourage use. The State is being urged by Orange County to absorb these service fees in the belief that revenue gained through credit card payments will far outweigh the costs of service fees.

The members discussed the drafting of a letter to the State encouraging it to consider absorbing credit card service fees. A quorum now being present, on motion of Mr. Murrell, seconded by Ms. Cohen, and carried unanimously, a draft letter will be included with a memo to the Board of Supervisors, giving notice of intent to send the letter to the State's Department of Finance. Copies of the letter are to be included in the monthly packets mailed to the CSAB Board members prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Paik also reported that:

- Other counties have been encouraging CPs to receive payments through direct deposit. Errors in inputting routing numbers have caused problems, but the State is attempting to update the website to improve the system.
- As of July 1, additional correspondence (such as employment or address changes) sent with NCP payments will no longer be sent back to counties

by the State.

- While a State-wide Call Center will not be operational for a few years, there is debate over the amount of waiting time the State will allow before a call being routed to a County is terminated.

Ms. Speir showed a copy of a check of an NCP recipient and pointed out that there was no indication of the County involved, and no information number for assistance. Some checks also lacked a case number. Ms. Paik also noted that in the case of multiple accounts, payments would be divided among them regardless of which account an NCP made payment for, and that there was no provision to determine this information. The members observed the lack of a date stamp on the check envelope itself and that it could easily be mistaken for junk mail.

STATUS REPORT ON BPR AND APPROVED RECOMMENDATIONS — JULIE PAIK

Ms Paik circulated a summary report on the status of approved recommendations and reported that:

- Of the fifteen recommendations that had been approved, all have been completed or are in progress except for Number 8 (Employee Incentive Programs), which does not have necessary funding.

Additional Highlights:

Recommendation #1: A method to improve monitoring of process servers was suggested.

Recommendation #2: Full implementation of civil contempt protocols and procedures requires Court approval. The Court is reviewing the program. Lori Cruz agreed to provide an updated report at the April meeting.

Recommendation # 5: A search is underway for a Volunteer Coordinator. However, volunteers must go through background checks and all County procedures like employees, and be covered under workers' compensation. While the program is still under exploration, implementation has been slowed.

Recommendation # 13: In some counties, a presumption exists that child care is no longer needed when the child reaches a certain age. CSSD is working with the Court on language that would similarly expedite cases in Los Angeles County.

Recommendation # 15: Mr. Golightly and Ms. Juiliano have been participating in trying to improve relationships with DCFS and the Dependency Courts. Mr. Golightly noted the recent policy change at DCFS where cases involving possible reunification are no longer subject to mandatory referral to CSSD. Concerns were also expressed regarding re-determination of status and communication between agencies.

APPROVE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 23, 2006

On motion of Jean Cohen, seconded by John Murrell, and carried unanimously, the minutes for February 23 were approved with corrections as directed by the Board.

REPORT ON OBTAINING / INPUTTING FAMILY LAW ORDERS

Ms. Juiliano reported that:

- The Wage Assignment Committee has previously worked to tighten up procedures and the monitoring process in regards to existing family law orders. Recently, efforts have been made to insure that terms of the order are input to the system and that financial accounts are activated.
- Training procedures have been updated in the KRIS system for the 859 process but have not yet been updated for the term validation process.
- Specialized staff is required because family law orders come into the Division.

CUSTOMER SERVICE COMMITTEE REPORT — MARIA TORTORELLI

No report was made.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was none.

MATTERS NOT ON THE POSTED AGENDA (to be presented and placed on a future agenda)

Mr. Logan has requested to appear before the Board to discuss his case at the next meeting in Commerce. Information regarding his case will be circulated to Board members.

DCSS report on the status of COAP program under \$5,000 (health insurance).

Update on “no welfare referral” issue from Gail Juiliano and Rose Ruiz and discussion of electronic referral.

Reserved Order Issue — ok given by County Counsel to discuss: 1) when a welfare CP and NCP are still living together and the CSSD gets a reserved order; and 2) what happens when there is a reserved order and new earnings income is reported. Also: update on use of the new Declaration being used by CSSD for upward modifications, draft of letter to the Board of Supervisors, discuss issue of legal dispute with CSSD.

Discussion of guidelines for CSAB concerns/disagreements with CSSD policy and Code of Ethics/Conduct for CSSD.

Discussions of Health Insurance Issue: getting insurance cards for children and getting medical reimbursements on behalf of the CP.

Written List of Current Campaigns

Foster Care Issue — When is it appropriate to have a referral? When is it appropriate for child support to stop?

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.